UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,148	01/23/2001	Chien-Sheng Chou	XER 2 0395 D/A0772	3609

7590 12/28/2005

Albert P. Sharpe, III, Esq.
Fay, Sharpe, Fagan, Minnich & McKee, LLP
7th Floor
1100 Superior Avenue
Cleveland, OH 44114-2518

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/768,148	CHOU, CHIEN-SHENG	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *08 September 2005*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16 and 18-29* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☒ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☐ Claim(s) *1,2,4-16 and 18-29* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

This communication is responsive to the Amendment filed 09/08/2005.

Claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-29 are pending in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are independent claims. In the Amendment filed 09/08/2005, Claims 1, 15, and 28 were amended and claim 29 was added as new. This action is made Non-Final.

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1, 2, 4-12, 15, 16, 18-26, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US

6412008) further in view of Huang (US 6052456) and further in view of Pereira, III (US 6931402).

In regards to claim 1, Helland teaches a system for generating a requisition for selectable items comprising: a client computer system connected to a network (Figure 3); a server computer system connected to the network, the network interconnecting the client computer system and the server computer system, the client computer configured to allow a plurality of users to access the server computer system (Figure 3); and a server application comprising a user interface running on the server computer system, the server application having a multi-tier architecture comprising a first tier of client application code for initiating processing by the server application in response to input by a user of the client computer system (i.e. "*The multi-tier architecture comprises a client tier for client application code that initiates processing by the server application in response to user input*" Abstract Line 3), a middle tier of object-oriented server application code (i.e. "*a middle tier of object-oriented server application Code*" Abstract, Line 6), and a third tier of shared access and data code (i.e. "*and a database tier of shared access data and management code*" Abstract, Line 7). Helland does not teach an application programming interface configured to allow customization of the user interface. Fields teaches, "*The request may include information regarding the client machine type, browser, and customization options (i.e. preferences). Customization options may include personal (i.e. user) options and group (i.e. department, corporate, etc.) options. These options, along with the client machine type and browser, are used by the server to determine how to customize the requested network file. The server*

obtains the requested network file, and a server-side customization program customizes the file." Abstract, Line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland with the teachings of Fields and include a method of customizing the user interface with the motivation to provide for an easy way to create a customized user interface.

Helland and Fields do not teach a system for generating a requisition for user selectable items wherein the server computer system is configured to: associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users; associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules; identify associated items which may be requisitioned by a user associated with the one or more associated work sites, and identify associated items which may not be requisitioned by a user associated with the tone or more associated work sites; receive and process a request for one or more user selected items; verify that each user requested item is an item associated with the user's one or more associated work sites; and generate a requisition for the verified user requested item. Huang teaches, teaches a system for generating a requisition for user selectable items wherein the server computer system is configured to: associate one or more of a plurality of work sites with each of said users, each worksite defining a group of users (i.e. "*the Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism may for example maintain records of (a) authorized User IDs; (b) the date and time each User ID expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (c) authorized Passwords for each authorized User ID; (d) the date and time each Password expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (e) the*

authorization level for each authorized User ID; (f) the User Group of which each user having an authorized User ID is a member; (g) the minimum authorization level required to execute each available command and access each available function; and (h) the User Group or Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function." Column 11, Line 3); associate items with one or more of a plurality of work sites using validation rules (i.e. "*(h) the User Group or Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function.*" Column 11, Line 13); identify associated items which may be requisitioned by a user associated with the one or more associated work sites, and identify associated items which may not be requisitioned by a user associated with the tone or more associated work sites (i.e. "*A user's authorization level determines which functions of the Telecommunications Switch Management System the user is authorized to access, and which commands the user is authorized to execute.*" Column 11, Line 36); receive and process a request for one or more user selected items; verify that each user requested item is an item associated with the user's one or more associated work sites; and generate a requisition for the verified user requested item (i.e. "*in order for a user to access a particular function or execute a particular command of the Telecommunications Switch Management System, the Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism typically would require that the user both (a) be a member of a User Group authorized to access the desired function or execute the desired command, and (b) have an authorization level at least as high as the minimum authorization level assigned to the function or command.*"(Column 14, Line 1). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland and Fields in view of Huang with the motivation to provide greater security to an ensure that only authorized users are able to access the system and even if a particular user is generally authorized to access the system, the user cannon access any portion or function of the system which the user is not specifically authorized to access (Huang, Column 10, Line 47).

Helland, Fields, and Huang do not teach each worksite defining a group of users having a common attribute required for requisitioning user selectable items including material related to the common attribute and associated with the work site. Pereira teaches, "As noted, in this exemplary Matrix database the attribute "Role" may be used to further define or control access to objects, i.e., beyond read, write, or read and write access based on the attributes Company, Site Location, Geographic Area, and Group. For example, the Matrix database may be used to control information about items for sale and the attribute "Role" may define a user's function with respect to the items for sale as relates to the other attributes of the Matrix database, i.e., the user's Group, Geographic Area, Site Location, Company, and Access. For example, the attribute "Role" may be assigned the value "Role1" for users who are authorized purchasers of the items for sale (subject to the other attributes of the Matrix database.) Thus, "Role1" represents "purchasers", "Role3" may represent "distributors", and "Role4" may represent "shipping agents"." (Column 5, Line 39). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields, and Huang with the teachings of Pereira and include a method of defining a group of users

having a common attribute required for requisitioning user selectable items including material related to the common attribute and associated with the work site with the motivation to provide access to different objects or different forms of access to objects in databases while not requiring duplicate information to be stored within a database of the profiling system (Pereira, Column 2, Line 12).

In regards to claim 2, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the user interface comprises one or more interface elements defined using HTML, the interface elements selected from one or more of input elements, form elements, and text elements ("*A client sends a request for a network file, such as a Web page, to a server. The request may include information regarding the client machine type, browser, and customization options (i.e. preferences). Customization options may include personal (i.e. user) options and group (i.e. department, corporate, etc.) options. These options, along with the client machine type and browser, are used by the server to determine how to customize the requested network file.*" Fields, Column 2, Line 40).

In regards to claim 4, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the client computer system comprises a web browser for accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network (Fields, Figure 1).

In regards to claim 5, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the server computer system comprises a requester database containing one or more of an

user identifier, a password, and personal information for the plurality of users (i.e. "*the Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism may for example maintain records of (a) authorized User IDs; (b) the date and time each User ID expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (c) authorized Passwords for each authorized User ID; (d) the date and time each Password expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (e) the authorization level for each authorized User ID; (f) the User Group of which each user having an authorized User ID is a member; (g) the minimum authorization level required to execute each available command and access each available function; and (h) the User Group or Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function.*" Huang, Column 11, Line 3).

In regards to claim 6, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 5. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the requester database contains at least one shared user entry, the shared user entry associated with a single work site (i.e. "*each User Group has assigned to it a list of functions which members of that User Group are authorized to access, and a list of commands which members of that User Group are authorized to execute.* " Huang, Column 12, Line 53).

In regards to claim 7, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 5. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises a work site database associating at least one of a plurality of work sites with each of the plurality of users (i.e. "*(h) the User Group or*

Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function." Huang, Column 11, Line 13)

In regards to claim 8, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 7. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the server computer system further comprises an inventory database containing information about the selectable items (i.e. "*each User Group has assigned to it a list of functions which members of that User Group are authorized to access, and a list of commands which members of that User Group are authorized to execute.* " Huang, Column 12, Line 53).

In regards to claim 9, Helland, Fields, and Huang teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein said information comprises one or more of a item identifying indicia, an item description, and an image representation of each item (Huang, Figures 12 and 13).

In regards to claim 10, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system further comprising a validation rules datastore associating each of said selectable items with one or more of a plurality of work sites with which a user must be associated to verify the item for a requisition (i.e. "*each User Group has assigned to it a list of functions which members of that User Group are authorized to access, and a list of commands which members of that User Group are authorized to execute.* " Huang, Column 12, Line 53).

In regards to claim 11, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 8. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the validation rules are customizable via said application programming interface (i.e. "the Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism is provided by System Manager 18 and Runtime Library 19 in conjunction with System Security Manager Client 54, which is located in System Management Interface 56, and System Security Manager Server 58." Huang, Column 10, Line 54).

In regards to claim 12, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 10. They do not specifically teach a system wherein the validation rules datastore is further configured to associate two or more of said selectable items with a single item identifier. However, official notice is given that it is well known in the art to associate two or more selectable items with a single item identifier (i.e. shortcuts). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields and Huang and include a system to associate two or more selectable items with a singe item identifier with the motivation to provide an easy way of accessing the identifier.

Claim 15 is in the same context as claim 1; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 16 is in the same context as claim 2; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 18, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches a system wherein the client computer

system comprises a web browser for accessing the network and communicating with the server over the network (Figure 1).

In regards to claim 19, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches wherein the client computer system and the server system communicate via the Internet (i.e. "*The system depicted in FIG. 12 may be linked to both local area networks (sometimes referred to as intranets) and wide area networks, such as the Internet.*" Column 9, Line 53).

Claim 20 is in the same context as claim 5; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 21 is in the same context as claim 6; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 22, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 17. Fields further teaches a system further comprising providing at least one managerial account associated with a single work site and allowing a user to generate a requisition for any other user associated with said single work site (i.e. "*For example, corporate options may be set by a system administrator, or included in the browser as it is distributed to various clients. Typically, individual users are not able to change corporate options. Corporate options may have to do with security, system performance, screening, etc.*" Column 5, Line 45).

In regards to claim 23, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 20. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a method wherein the step of assigning a work site to a user is performed by retrieving previously

stored information associating each user with at least one of a plurality of work sites (i.e. "*the Full Group Privileges Access Mechanism may for example maintain records of (a) authorized User IDs; (b) the date and time each User ID expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (c) authorized Passwords for each authorized User ID; (d) the date and time each Password expires and therefore becomes unauthorized; (e) the authorization level for each authorized User ID; (f) the User Group of which each user having an authorized User ID is a member; (g) the minimum authorization level required to execute each available command and access each available function; and (h) the User Group or Groups authorized to execute each available command and access each available function.*" Column 11, Line 3).

Claim 24 is in the same context as claim 8; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 25 is in the same context as claim 9; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 26 is in the same context as claim 10; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

In regards to claim 29, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 1. Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira further teach a system wherein the common attribute is the geographical location of the user (i.e. "As noted, in this exemplary Matrix database the attribute "Role" may be used to further define or control access to objects, i.e., beyond read, write, or read and write access based on the attributes Company, Site Location, Geographic Area, and Group. For example, the

Matrix database may be used to control information about items for sale and the attribute "Role" may define a user's function with respect to the items for sale as relates to the other attributes of the Matrix database, i.e., the user's Group, Geographic Area, Site Location, Company, and Access. For example, the attribute "Role" may be assigned the value "Role1" for users who are authorized purchasers of the items for sale (subject to the other attributes of the Matrix database.) Thus, "Role1" represents "purchasers", "Role3" may represent "distributors", and "Role4" may represent "shipping agents"." Pereira, Column 5, Line 39).

Claims 13 and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008) in further view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) in view of Pereira, III (US 6931402) and further view of Lee et al. (US 6611814).

In regards to claim 13, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 5. They do not teach a system further comprising a database storing a list of items preselected by the user to be used at a later time to create a requisition. Lee teaches, "*A shopper can create a wish list in an online store and record information on products he or she wants to buy from the store in the list.*" Column 1, Line 53). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira with the teachings of Lee and include a list of items desired with the motivation to provide the user with an easy method of

purchasing products at a later time and not having to remember what was desired for purchase.

Claim 27 is in the same context as claim 13; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 14 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Helland et al (US 6714962) in view of Fields et al (US 6412008) in view of Huang et al. (US 6052456) in view of Pereira, III (US 6931402) and in further view of Walker et al. (US 6466919).

In regards to claim 14, Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira teach all the limitations of claim 5. They do not teach a system further comprising a requisition database containing information about previously generated requisitions. Walker teaches, "*The buyer identifier stored in field 565 may be utilized, for example, to index a historical database (not shown) of previous purchases and CPOs associated with the buyer.*" Column 11, Line 6). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Helland, Fields, Huang, and Pereira with teachings of Walker and include a system of tracking previously generated orders with the motivation to without difficulty determine shopping habits of users.

Claim 28 is in the same context as claim 14; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 2, 4-16, and 18-29 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiry

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (571) 272-4070. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT
TECHNOLOGY

BP